

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, December 13, 2012, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) *FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.*
- 2) *One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current 6 components of an R-PP should be met.*
- 3) *Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear this in mind when commenting.*
- 4) *Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.*

Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

The purpose of the R-PP is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.

Review of R-PP of: Burkina Faso

Reviewer (fill in): UK, International Organization Observer (IUCN), France (AFD,
Lead)

Date of review (fill in): 25/11/2013

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 6:)

Overview

Burkina Faso is already part of the FIP and its RPP has benefited from different reviews, within the FIP and the FCPF through an informal review in June 2012 (PC 12-Santa Martha).

One of the major strength of the Burkina Faso REDD+ process is the quality of the consultation process and information sharing, at the national level as well as at the sub-national level.

The breakdown by agro-ecological zones provides an appropriate framework to capture the drivers of deforestation and the REDD+ strategy-options, in a cross-sectoral approach.

The need for additional data is pressing and an update on the current situation of the ongoing forest inventory would be useful.

The methodology and the time-period regarding the reference level and the MRV system have been more detailed and seem to be more appropriate in this last version of the RPP.

The RPP provides a detailed evaluation framework with the different steps, timeframe and indicators. A hierarchy between these indicators would be nonetheless welcome.

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process, and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The institutional framework is clearly described.

The terms of reference, composition and available budget of the different committees are provided and a strategy for conflict resolution is presented and is based on existing legislation.

1. The “national platform for conciliation” is based on existing institutions: no new structures are created, so that REDD+ process is embedded in existing conciliation and consultation processes.
2. Inclusion of research networks is welcomed as should provide a good sustainability mechanism
3. Inclusion of additional seats on the National REDD+ Committee is well noted and would encourage that implementation ensures linkages to representation of major groups that was identified - as is now addressed -- under Standard 1c

The standard is met

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The overrepresentation of public institutions and authorities in the first consultation has been assessed and balanced for the next consultation phase in order to ensure that the REDD coordination unit will be open to civil society, local or governmental representatives.

The standard is met

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The Consultation and Participation Process is clearly designed as a bottom-up approach with the organisations of consultations in 8 000 villages and REDD Commune-level Committees in 302 rural communes. There will be 7 "waves of consultation" from the villages to the National Platform addressing 7 different issues with outcomes captured in synthesis and minutes.

The RPP acknowledges that this approach and these targets are ambitious. In order to maximise

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

the chance of success, the first villages to be targeted will be the one where the FIP Projects are already in place.

This approach highlights i) the link between the FIP and the FCPF proposal, ii) the cross sectoral approach.

One can nonetheless wonder how the last “waves of consultation” will manage to stick to the agenda and some adjustments could be considered in the operational phase and included in the budget.

The standard is met

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Land Use Change Drivers, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country’s REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

1. The breakdown by agro-ecological zones illustrated in table 9 (P 52), drawing on the results of a previous project initiative, is an appropriate framework for organizing the driver analysis and is an excellent contribution to the R-PP document.

P 50-55 provides a good overview of changes in forest cover, quality and carbon stocks over the past 20 years. These data will be essential to creation of a baseline.

The report actually shows changes in land cover for a period of 20 years, but 11 years ago... between 1992 and 2002. It seems a bit abusive to consider that this overview covers a 20 years period of time. This highlights the need for additional data and how the forest inventory is necessary.

2. Figure 4 (P 56) shows the change in rainfall patterns that indicate significant consequences for changes in carbon sequestration potential that will have to be taken into account in modelling future potential. For instance the second national inventory is currently underway (2011-2013) (P 55) could a provisional update be drawn from this?
3. At P 55 what is the reason behind the decision to use the Burkinabe Government figure deforestation of 2% over the FAO rate of 1%? Is it based on definition of a forest?
4. Perhaps further information on how laws are going to be strengthened would also be useful, as the report states:

“The Burkina Faso government is making considerable efforts in the form of reforms to land tenure and forest regulations”... However... “This law is still not implemented due to a lack of local structures and necessary skills and conflicts

continue to emerge .In the absence of land tenure records or an inventory of the types of land rights, these unresolved conflicts lead to the existence of legal grey areas, which is conducive to deforestation.” (P 67)

How is this going to be tackled? Is what is written on P 67 regarding the role of the PNSR and in table 24 on P 79 strong enough? Especially as in section 2b on P 84, Table 25 the predominant underlying causes of deforestation appears to be poor land use planning and tenure. As stated on P 85... as the reviewer says:

“A key element of (the R-PP’s) approach is to improve land tenure security at the most local level as a basis for encouraging investment in actions that conserve or enhance biocarbon stocks. The legal and regulatory frameworks to accomplish this are mostly in place but the need is to promote broader understanding of these “rights” and to strengthen and expand their application at local scale.”

Perhaps a better emphasis on how these regulatory frameworks will be promoted/ strengthened would be useful.

The standard is met

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

Recommendations:

1. It is clear that the availability of FIP funding and the associated implementation plan is a strength for the Government and should lead to a strong possibility of successful implementation of a REDD+ Strategy
2. Reference to lessons learned from previous projects is useful.
3. The proposal emphasizes the key importance of rural land tenure to success in implementing the program. To achieve this, the reviewers recommend efforts to expand awareness, understanding and application of Law 034-2009 in rural communities as progress in the evolution from R-PP to implemented REDD+ Strategy.

4. There could be more detail on the proposed strategy and programme to increase area under classified forests from today's 14% to 30% in the future, the afforestation programme and development of NFTP.
5. Emphasis on agro-pastoral systems, trees on farm and inclusion of commune-level are an excellent model of cross-sectoral approaches.
6. Two excellent summaries are included -- Figure 10 (tree diagram showing the link between direct causes of deforestation and degradation, underlying causes and REDD+ strategic options) as well as Table 27 that summarizes emissions reductions by expected outcome.

The standard is met

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

Agree with TAP - no further comments.

The standard is met

Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence in the form of an assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts as part of the SESA process. It also provides a description of safeguard issues that are relevant to the country's readiness preparation efforts. For FCPF countries, a simple work plan is presented for conducting the SESA process, cross referencing other components of the R-PP as appropriate, , and for preparing the ESMF.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

The SESA will follow the World Bank safeguards and a particular attention will be paid on gender issue. The other legal frameworks are also presented as guaranteeing the whole process.

As recommended by the TAP, the SESA will be initiated early in the process.

The standard is met

Component 3. Develop a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Standard 3: a National Forest Reference Emission Level and/or a Forest Reference Level

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (monitoring system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

1. The approach is well appreciated, especially the attempt to link it to the drivers of deforestation and give these drivers different weighting.
2. As noted by the TAP, the five-year interval for review and adjustments of baseline calculations is appropriate.
3. The recommendations of the TAP, especially regarding the reference scenarios using data on agricultural expansion should be followed.

The standard is met

Component 4. Design Systems for National Forest Monitoring and Information on Safeguards

Standard 4a: National Forest Monitoring System:

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

1. The proposal clearly demonstrates what data and monitoring requirements are available in the country, there is a clear understanding of the methodological framework and existing monitoring capacity, however clarifications would be needed on the approach taken with regards to:
 - i. Addressing "leakage" in a national monitoring system, P 140 para 2.
 - ii. Proposed country specific methodology for estimating emissions/removals and changes in carbon stocks (P 142), this does not appear to be consistent with IPCC methodology
 - iii. Seek clarification whether reporting will be at tier 2 and progress to tier 3 and for which land use types and key categories.
2. The proposal to use a 0.25 ha level of resolution is good, provided it can be done, this is labour and resource intensive.
3. The national capacity in analysis and interpretation of data could be elaborated a little bit more.
4. The proposed 5 year reporting interval by area, strata and carbon stocks and inclusion of agro-forestry is relevant and will enable a consistent times series to be established for the GHG inventory reporting, Burkina Faso already has some Landsat data sets covering entire territory dating back in 1975 and 1990 and 2003 (and are currently preparing updated data sets from 2010 and will be completed 2014).
5. Regarding the monitoring and evaluation of monitoring programmes some precisions would be useful, especially on how verification of emissions/removals will be carried out and

audited.

6. Agree with TAP review on budget allocations.

The standard is largely met

Standard 4b: Designing an Information System for Multiple Benefits, Other Impacts, Governance, and Safeguards :

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-Plan meets this standard, and recommendations:

Agree with TAP - no further comments - both the workplan and additional planned budget for public consultation is much improved over previous submissions

The standard is met

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

Reviewer’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

1. The budget is clear and the representation of financing including co-financing from other donors is very good.
2. Nonetheless, the absence of national funding is a great concern and make think about the real political commitment of BF in the REDD process. The “in kind” funding by the government is not sufficient and some guarantees of such a funding should be provided. A dialogue with the government on the possibility for a national contribution in the future should be opened.

The standard is met

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

Reviewer's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard, and recommendations:

1. Agree with TAP - no further comments.

The standard is met